







## NEW-YORK SATURDAY, MARCH 24, 1860

Those who weary themselves to imagine and exhibit cases of ancient *slavholding*, are in the habit of supposing cases that can rarely if ever occur, or which, when sifted to the bottom, are found to be no cases of *slavholding* at all, but only of redemption and enfranchisement. If they *can* succeed in causing an opponent, or of drawing from him a confession of the *innocency* of any particular person whose case they have thus presented, they become at once exultant, and applying the exception to the general fact, proclaim boasting, that the *innocency* of *slavholding* has been successfully demonstrated.

The same immunity might be as honestly employed, and with equal success, in proving that robbery and theft, the forcible or secret taking of property, without the owner's consent, in certain peculiar cases, may be innocent, and then, on the strength of a concession, in this particular case proclaiming that robbery and theft are not *in se*, inherently sinful.

One simple dilemma may dispose of all these ingeniously contrived cases. Unless they are exceptions to the general facts or conditions of slaveholding, they cannot be innocent. If they are exceptions, then the exception only confirms instead of invalidating the rule.

Or, thus: The case described either does constitute a case of slaveholding, or it does not. If it *does*, then it constitutes a case of man-stealing, and is sinful. If it does not, then it proves nothing concerning the innocence of slaveholding.

Or thus, again. If the case be found to be a case of man-stealing, then, if the Bible, be true, it is, of course, sinful. But if it be not a case of man-stealing, then it is not a case of slaveholding, (for the terms are convertible) and affords no evidence against the sinfulness of slaveholding.

The three names most prominent before the nation, at the present time, for prospective nomination for the Presidency, are Douglas, Seward and Bates, the Republicans dividing their attention chiefly, between the two latter. It is natural to inquire into the position of these candidates in respect to the great questions arising out of the existence of slavery.

Of Mr. SEWARD it is doubtless believed that he is the most strongly Antislavery of any of the persons in his party who have been talked of as candidates. His especial friends would claim this for him. His opponents charge it as an objection against him. Let us see then what sort of an A. A. Seward was. Mr. Seward is

—Mr. ELLIS has been for twenty years helping to educate the Anti-Slavery journals, for inviting Christian Congress, that he would shoulder his burden to aid in putting down a slave dissection in any Southern State. This was considered the *very pulse of freedom* in that Christianized country, and he was the only man in the North who spoke with a southern voice in different language, when he said to the Slave States, represented in the Senate, "if you were sovereigns, would be assailed, no matter what the pretext, or the force, we shall resist it, as the *quintessence of wrong*." Not even the sharpest and most bitter of its opponents has since been able to deny the truth of his words. It is the current change of radicalism, or sentimentalism against him, except perhaps his distinction between the South and North as Capital States and Labor States respectively—and yet this distinction, so far from being original with Mr. Seward, is simply adopted from Mr. Webster's Plymouth oration of the Word Union, and the Slave States, and Free States.

The agriculture of these regions is a sort of commerce, and it is a species of employment in which labor seems to form an inconsiderable ingredient in the productive classes—since the portion white labor is exceedingly small, and slave labor is rather more like profit on stock or capital than labor properly so called.

ing States have had less knowledge. *The St. Louis Evening News* of Nov. 4th. defines his position for him, with much confidence. It represents him as being opposed to the extension of Slavery into Territories already free—holds that slavery is not protected by the Constitution, but only by local law. The rejoices that Missouri is becoming a free-State, and would have the Federal Government provide a Territory for colonizing free blacks. But—(we quote from the *New* York

"Mr. Bates believes in the unalienable right of the sworn member of Congress to receive his salary if he escapes to a Free State, and if the President, he would execute the Fugitive Slave law, if the army and navy of the Government were equal to the task. And if the Fugitive Slave Law should be repealed, or should be found inadequate to the service of returning all fugitive slaves to their masters, Mr. Bates would earnestly recommend to Congress to pass some law that would certainly and more speedily capture the recalcitrant and fugitive guerrillas and their cohorts, and their military shieldholders. He would consider the United States broken and give up this plain government, were denied any of the legitimate and preserving national and civil liberties of the people."

Of these statements of views, the *New York Tribune* (Nov. 14) says:

"The views respecting Slavery of Edward Bates of Missouri, as authoritatively set forth by *The St. Louis Evening News*," will inevitably be studied and pondered by every intelligent and reflecting American. While they do not in all respects accord with our conviction, we hail them as embodying the sandest, the clearest, the most forcible expressions yet put forth of the genuine Conservative sentiment of our country. Mr. Bates in politics belongs to the school of Henry Clay, of whom he was, while in public life, thirty odd years ago, and has remained ever since, an ardent, sincere and disciple."

The N. Y. Independent indicates its preference for Sew

friend, Judge Bates has been commended in some quarters with in undue activity and periphrasy, while in other quarters the proposal of his name has been rejected and denounced for reasons which seems to savor more of party-spirit and party-policy than of simple patriotism. We do not at all believe that Judge Bates will receive the nomination at Chicago for the office of President; nor do we, in the whole, desire that he should be thus nominated. We are, therefore, the more free to say that we know him personally as well as by his public reputation, and that we have no better man to suggest than he, for the office of President, who has no better qualities than religious fidelity, and far-sighted and patient patriotism, and manly independence of spirit, the greatest of which the President now could be more safely committed.

Did the *Independent* say this, while apprized of the position of Mr. Bates on the enforcement of the rendition of fugitive slaves? Would its editor advise christians to vote for such a candidate on the principle taking up with "the best government you can get"? How long would it take for them to see that a good government, in this plan

We are happy to announce the appearance of this long expected work, of which we gave notice some time since, viz. *The Guilt of Slavery, and the Crime of Marching, demonstrated from the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures*. By GEORGE B. CURRIE, D. D., Pastor of the Church of the Puritans, &c., &c. Boston. John P. Jewett & Company, 20 Washington Street, 1840. pp. 472.

"The argument which we propose to develop," says the author, in his introduction, "demonstrating the iniquity of slavery, is four-fold: philological, statutory, or legal, historical and moral. The argument, from consequences, is both historical and moral."

In his "CHAPTER II," on "The varieties of the demonstration against slavery," &c., the author enumerates no less than twenty-two different forms of argument, each of which he briefly illustrates. The volume is divided into forty-two chapters, embracing as many distinct topics.

In examining the passages of S. 81 rules bearing on alms, very, including those, esp. eially, that have been claimed to be in its favor, Dr. Chacev. has resorted directly to the original Greek and Hebrew, studying most thoroughly by the means of the words as elsewhere employed, and in the light of known facts and changes, the precise shades of idiomatic, grammatical, and even occasionally, connotative differences.

is pervaded for the support of slavery. In the all-around spirit of his work he has probably surpassed all his predecessors, and we trust, he has forever settled the question if there could be any question ably raised whether a Book with the known and acknowledged principles of the Bible, could have given its sanction, in 1787, to all passages, to a system of practices and usages the most intensely *opposite* to those principles, that could be conceived, the condemning its details, the grand and saved ends for which the volume was designed. But we need not try to study Dr. Thompson's Book, and we need not mean to write as, though we can now claim that, before we can do better it, that we can reach research and impotence. We humbly would add to our readers

We are obliged to notice that the *Liberator* and the *National Anti-Slavery Standard* are regarding the late speech of Mr. Seward in deftling terms. From some causes, these journals and Wendell Phillips have been wont to read the utterances of Mr. Seward with other eyes than we have been able to do. But, in the present instance, we find them at one with us.

— This speech greatly disappoints us, not in the rhetorical skill or power of condensation, or clearness of statement, or historical accuracy, for it is a very creditable performance in these particulars; but because it evinces, throughout, the adroit, calculating heartless politician rather than the wise, courageous far-seeing statesman. It has no pulsations of life, no throbbings of humanity, has wholly destitute of moral feeling and purpose. Instead of reasserting the doctrine of an "irrepressible conflict" between Freedom and Slavery, it is a lethargic attempt to keep the matter as long as possible in a state of suspended collision—between these forces, and that there is no reason why they may not remain in juxtaposition without heat or rivalry, *ad infinitum*."

[illegible]

"These very qualities, however, are the ones which will commend Mr Sewall to the leaders of the party, who will shape the nomination. Their error, we think, lies in taking it for granted that they are sure of the anti-slavery voters of the North, and that all they can secure of the pro-slavery ones, by coming as near to their level as they can, will be so much gained. They are more likely to lose the first without gaining the last."

We think the Standard, the Liberator, and Wendell Phillips are supposing that Mr Seward's "irresponsible" conflict" speech at Rochester meant any thing more than to draw off from Gerrit Smith, sufficient to secure, as he did, the election of E D. Morgan, at a time when the principal journals of the party did not expect it. Abolitionists generally failed to scrutinize that speech as closely as they should have done. Had they searched, they would have discovered in it an explanation sufficiently ample to cover the whole ground of his recent speech in the Senate. We noticed it, at the time, and just as soon as the election was over and the desired object secured, the *Tribune* noticed it likewise and has been ever since parading it.

may be drawn with an unweildome object, far off in the back ground, where it is *half* noticed, makes little or no impression, and is melted by the distance, while an elegant edifice occupies the fore-ground. The same artist, to gratify other tastes, may paint the same landscape, including the same objects, from a different stand-point, bringing into the fore-ground the object that was before seen in the distance, and seeking into the distance what was before in the fore-ground. The result is a new picture, and the artist has brought forth the impossible *conceit*, but the fore-ground is, in these, the *achievements*, with the exception, that *perspective* it was so brief and distinct that it was scarcely discerned, while the *time* speed, *brings* the disclaimer into the fore-ground, where it *shines*, if it does not absolutely *repulse* the impossible *conceit*. The two species contain the same *time* *place* and *color*, but the *achievements* being in the *perspective*. We saw nothing in the first that we did not see in the last, we saw nothing in the last that we did not see in the first. The artist, Mr. Seward, has been the first to show the impossibility of Rochester, the second from Washington city. The people should *bring* the laws of *perspective*, and *adapt* them to the species of *perspective*. But Mr Seward at Rochester again, with the same surroundings, as you will have to see, *bring* the

## News of the Dan.

## WAR WITH MEXICO.

Are the United States at war with Mexico? Such a word is scarce. Time was, when the question of peace or war, with a foreign nation, had to be submitted to both Houses of Congress, and discussed and voted upon by the Representatives of the people, and the Senators from the several States. That time has gone by. The Seminoles war, and the late war with Mexico, have practically annulled that part of the Constitution, which says: "*Congress shall have power to declare war.*" Congress is in Session, but the President issues his orders to his military and naval officers, without consulting them. The news that the Government of this country is at war with a neighboring Republic, comes, not by the formal, time-consuming, and swaying, unpop, as unexpectedly as it does to their constituents. Talk-of-monarchy! Talk of consolidation! The President is absolute—nay, rather, he is the tool if the slavery oligarchy, whose rule is a necessity inseparable from the existence of slavery in the States, which, even the opposition party pledges itself to not.

From *The N. Y. Times*:

[illegible]

The *Herald* and *The Tribune* announced the news without comment. *The Times* editorial has the following:

## CONGRESS.

WASHINGTON, March 18th

THE TARIFF.—The new Tariff bill will be reported to the House to-morrow, under the revised rules.

March 20th

Mr. Sumner introduced the Senate a memorial signed by four hundred citizens of Boston, asking for the repeal of the Fugitive Slave law of 1850, the abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia, and the passage of a resolution compelling Congress against the acquisition of any more Slave Territory. In motion Mr. Davis the position was laid down in the table by a vote 420 to 179 Various measures were proposed by Mr. Wilson for more effectual suppression of the African Slave-trade. It introduced a bill authorizing the construction of five steamships for the special purpose of conveying the African-untaken a joint resolution directing the President to suspend all trade relations with the United States with any nation which refused to give up the right of its citizens to engage in the slave-trade of the Western Hemisphere and to enter disavowing the Treasury Committee to report a bill making imprisonment for life the penalty for engaging in the African Slave-trade, and extending punishment to the owners of slave ships.

A remarkable change has taken place within the last forty-eight hours in the minds of those legislators who have opposed the Nicaragua and Mexico Treaties. The Democratic Senators hold a majority in a room to discuss the propriety of renouncing all effort to make any treaty with any Spanish-American empire, since the Republicans have brought matters to a dead lock. The Republican Senators also held a caucus on the same subject, and the discussion was warm. The result was that Senator Dixon of Connecticut, and several others, joined the Democrats. Wilson the policy indicated by his vote in the Nicaragua Treaty, and it is said that the Republicans will unite with the Democrats to carry the Mexican Treaty, and, if practicable, to denounce the Nicaragua Treaty and pass it. There are indications of an entire change in the Republican Platform. The speech of Mr. Cox in the House, on Mexico, is regarded as a superb exposition of the subject by those who understand it. The trouble is that there are not many in Congress who know enough about Mexico to appreciate an effort like that of Mr. Cox.<sup>1</sup>

The above is from a correspondent of the *N. Y. Times* the Editor of which says,

"We are not surprised to here that the incident has made a sensation at Washington. Whatever other effect it may produce, it can scarcely fail to satisfy the Republican Senators that it is by no means safe merely to divert the Government, in its attempts to place our relations with the Spanish American States upon a fixed and satisfactory basis. They are in so critical a condition that were inactive they will not answer. Something must be done. We must either have peace, upon terms regulated by treaties, or we shall drift into war.

Senator Wilson is entitled to great credit for the sagacity and the independence of his action upon these questions and we are not surprised to hear that some of his Republican colleagues are inclined to retrace their steps, and endeavor to avert the new issues and fresh perils which seem about to come upon the country. We hope they may succeed.

In other words, the Republicans must needs vie with the Democrats, in sustaining the administration in its filthiest, most guttering attacks upon Mexico, lest they should lose votes in the Presidential Election. But will this help them?—*Ed. Principles.*

THE Washington Correspondent of *The Boston Traveller* in his last letter, alludes as follows to the case of Mr. Hyatt.

"Mr. Mac's real beliefs were passed by a vote of 44 to 10, and singular as it may appear, Toombs was found voting with Sumner, Wade, and Wilson. Mr. Hyatt was introduced to jail, and placed in the custody of a night-guard suffering from the combined effects of illness and the nervous condition consequent upon his illness. He was released the next day, and returned to his friends. Last night Judge Conway was released, and left for his home, where he was met by a large number of his friends. Mr. Hyatt was released last night, and left for his home, where he was met by a large number of his friends. Mr. Hyatt was released last night, and left for his home, where he was met by a large number of his friends.

## NEW YORK LEGISLATURE.

Annals March 17

FUEL SURF R

The resolution to submit to the people a proposition for an amendment to the Constitution, & as to abolish the qualification for colored voters, was taken up and passed by the following vote:

YEARS—Messrs. Abell, Bell, Ferry, Goss, Hammond, Lapham, McGraw, Manierre, Montgomery, Munroe, Prosser, Ramsey, Richmond, Sessions, Truman, Warner, Williams—

NAIS—Messrs. Blood, Connelley, Fiero, Gardiner, Grant, Kelly, Lawrence, Robertson, Spinale—9.  
The resolution passed the Assembly some time ago.

The act for the Protection of the Property Rights of Married Women, which has passed both branches of our Legislature, and now lacks only the approval of the Governor to become a law, is the most comprehensive and thorough measure of the kind ever passed by a legislative body. We do not see that, though less would have been inadequate, more could reasonably be desired so far as property is concerned. That act will enable five thousand women in our State to earn and save, and live on their own resources, who are now living in suzerainty, and whose furniture and even clothing, in the case of each, belongs to a reprobate or drunkard who first deceived, then deserted her, leaving her to toil in penury for a bare subsistence, [able at any moment to be stripped of her few belongings by the same man.] We wish the act had said more expressly that if a widowed mother shall not be deprived of her children by her husband's will, shall be their guardian whenever the proper authority does not appoint another, [but the act is so good that we can hardly speak of this as a fault.] Let us rejoice that, in spite of all dissenting arguments, the world does move.—*Tribune.*

### Finale of the Harper's Ferry Affair

## EXECUTION OF STEVENS AND HALLET

CHARLESTOWN, Va., Friday, March 16, 1860.

The town was thronged with visitors to-day, and several companies of military were in attendance. Stevens and Hazlett were hung at noon. They appear resigned to their fate. Stevens died very hard, while Hazlett died without a struggle. Both exhibited great firmness and resignation.

There were no religious exercises at the gallows, as the prisoners persisted in refusing all the kindly offices of the ministry in their last moments. Both of their bodies have been forwarded to Martins Spring, South Anboy N. J. They will reach Baltimore in the early morning train.—*True News*

The remains of Stevens and Hazlett were brought to Englewood, N. J. for interment. The execution took place on Friday. The remains were forwarded by express, and reached Railway on Saturday, when they were taken to the place where the remains of Stevens were to be interred. The remains were not submitted to the care of an undertaker. The features were scarcely recognizable, and they were not shown either to the intimate friends of the deceased or at the funeral. Attached to the last shroud of Stevens' coffin was a note from the State Prison, dated May 1, 1892, but before it was issued his friends were not informed. His betrayer accompanied his remains from Charleston, and was joined at Englewood by his father and sister—

The near approach of the day of execution seemed to have but little effect on the prisoners, and for the next few days they were as cheerful as ever. Stevens declared it was his wish to be free, and therefore desired the day for his execution to arrive. Mrs. Pearce, the sister of Stevens, was with him up to yesterday morning, and made a fine impression on all with whom she was thrown by her lady-like deportment and conduct. On Thursday a Miss Duellier, of Ohio, arrived in town. It is said she was engaged to be married to Stevens at the time of the Harper's Ferry massacre, and had corresponded with him since his imprisonment in this town. She is a lady of much intelligence and beauty.

A brother of Hazlett, who resides at Armstrong County, Pa., also arrived a few days ago, and was present with his brother until yesterday morning. He advised Hazlett to make a full confession of his connection with the Brown party, and to renounce the leadership of all hope of a reprieve or commutation of punishment.





